DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 758 HE 027 942

AUTHOR Boden, Dana W. R.
TITLE A University Libraries Faculty Perspective on the Role of the Department Head in Faculty Performance: A Grounded Theory Approach. Revised.
PUB DATE Dec 94
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; *College Faculty; *College Libraries; *Department Heads; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Interviews; Librarian Attitudes; *Librarians; Library Administration; Qualitative Research; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study examined the perceptions that university library faculty members hold regarding the role of the department head in promoting faculty growth and development. Four faculty members at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln were interviewed. Axial coding of the individuals' perceptions revealed six categories of perceived roles for library department heads: advocate, communicator, counselor, leader, manager, and motivator. These categories identify strategies that department heads could implement to better serve their faculty's needs. Seven appendixes provide information on methodology, data collection, and interview question format; transcriptions of two interviews; and coding charts. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 758

A University Libraries Faculty Perspective on the Role of the Department Head in Faculty Performance: A Grounded Theory Approach

By
Dana W. R. Boden

April 1991

Revised, December 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dana W. R. Boden is an Assistant Professor and Liaison Librarian at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University Libraries.

HE 027 942

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dana Wayne Rippy

Boden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

I. Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative research project was to gain an insight into the perceptions university library faculty members hold regarding the role of the department head in promoting faculty growth and development. Promoting faculty growth and development may include, but is not limited to, activities to enhance faculty performance, professional development, professional growth, productivity, professional involvement, faculty publishing, or progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

This paper will note the nonexistent literature in this area and the low number of pure qualitative research studies in the library field. The reasons for using qualitative methods for this research will be explained, specifically the reasons for using the grounded theory approach. The questions to be addressed by this study will be noted. The data collection method will be outlined, as will be the process of data analysis. From the analysis of the data appropriate premises and propositions will be generated. The literature will then be returned to, to show any support for the study's findings found in the broader literature. The conclusion will note any possible future application of this research and possibilities for further research in the area.

II. Initial Review of the Literature

When using the grounded theory approach to research "you do not want to be constrained by having to adhere to a previously developed theory" nor do you "want to be so steeped in the literature as to be

constrained and even stifled in terms of creative efforts" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 49-50). Thus I will review the literature only generally to establish that the research I undertook was in reality in a new area.

A review of the literature specifically relating to university library faculty shows that no research has been done on library faculty members' perceptions of the role of the department head in faculty growth and development. In fact the reverse research has not been approached either, that is, research on university library department heads' perceptions of their role in promoting professional growth and development among the faculty in their departments. One article reported the results of a quantitative survey of support for publishing in Association of Research Libraries (ARL) libraries. This merely shows statistics of what exists and does not address perceptions of the faculty or the department head (Cosgriff, Kenney, and McMillan, 1990). Another article's author puts forth his perceptions of the role of the university library director in leading and managing librarians with faculty status (Hersberger, 1989).

Not only is there no literature in the specific area of this research, the amount of scholarly research on libraries-related topics using qualitative methods is minimal. An article describing a grounded theory approach to a library problem noted "it applied rarely used methods of qualitative research" (Mellon, 1986). So it is that the research undertaken here breaks new ground with its topic and applies methods of research not common to the field.

III. Basis for Using Qualitative Research Methods

This study was undertaken to research the personal perceptions of faculty in a university library regarding the role of the department head. My desire was to gain insight into the faculty members' feelings on this topic. I did not wish to begin with a theory and test it, rather my wish was to gather information and, hopefully, be able to generate a theory from the data gathered. The information I wished to collect was not statistical in nature.

According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 17) qualitative research is "any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification." Qualitative researchers are interested in the process of the research, how persons interpret their world, and an inductive research process. The researcher is the data collector and analyst, which must go to the people for data collection and then reports findings in a descriptive way (Merriam, 1988, p. 17-20). That is the type of research I undertook with this project.

There are several types of qualitative research methods: case studies, ethnographies, symbolic interactionism, and grounded theory. Case studies investigate contemporary phenomena within their real-life context and are the preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed (Yin, 1984). Ethnographies attempt to "paint a portrait" of the individual or individuals under study. The individuals are observed extensively in their daily activities and 'key informants' may be interviewed to clarify observations (Wallen & Frankel, 1991). Symbolic interactionism entails the study of the social interaction processes which effect the development of

the individual's point of view (Blumer, 1969). The three approaches described here were not appropriate for the type of study I wished to do.

The grounded theory approach was the method chosen to conduct this study. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 23):

> A grounded theory is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents. That is, it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon. Therefore, data collection, analysis and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other. One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge.

Library faculty perspectives on the role of the department head had not been previously researched. The grounded theory approach would not pre-predict that perspective, but would allow it to present itself in the research results. This method perfectly fit the way in which I wished, in fact needed, to manage my research.

IV. Questions for Research

Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 38) state "The research question in a grounded theory study is a statement that identifies the phenomenon to be studied." The "big question" in this study was:

> From a faculty perspective, what should the role of the department head be in promoting faculty growth and development?

This question explicitly identified the area to be studied -- the role of the department head from the faculty members' viewpoint. The other related questions were intended to draw out further information related to the initial question. Those questions were:

1. What type of leadership do University Libraries faculty need from their department head to encourage greater faculty performance?

2. In what way has the department head addressed those needs?

3. What forms of performance assistance have faculty members in the University Libraries received from their department head?

4. Are there strategies you have observed your department head, or other department heads, using with other faculty which you believe has been effective in enhancing those faculty members' professional growth or performance?

These questions, though they sound very similar, or perhaps even redundant, prompted those questioned to think further about the topic from a slightly different perspective. Also, it caused them to expand on the thoughts they initially expressed.

V. Methodology for Data Collection

Conrad (1978, p. 101-102) defines grounded theory as "theory generated from data systematically obtained and analyzed through the constant comparative method." This method incorporates the "reciprocal relationship" between data collection, analysis, and theory that Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 23) outlined in their definition of grounded theory. That is to say that the three processes may take place nearly simultaneously. All data is not collected, then analyzed, then the theory generated. Instead the data is analyzed as it is collected. This analysis may influence the gathering of further data. Theories may be generated during the collection and analysis phases and further data collection used to substantiate or refute the intermediate theories.

In this project university library faculty perceptions of the role of the department head in promoting faculty growth and develop-

ment were gathered using individual interviews. Four faculty members in the University Libraries of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln were selected for interviewing. Each gave their consent for the interview to be recorded on audio cassette tape. The interviewer also took notes during the interviews. Initially, two untenured faculty members in two different public services departments were interviewed. To allow for the minimization and maximization of differences between comparative interviewees as called for in the constant comparative method (Conrad, 1978, p. 103), the remaining two interviewees varied from that pattern. The third interviewee was a recently tenured faculty member in a public services department, while the fourth was an untenured faculty member in a technical services department.

VI. Analysis of Collected Data

Using the constant comparative method, the data collected from the interviews was first categorized using open coding techniques. Open coding is a process which breaks down, examines, compares, conceptualizes and categorizes data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). After establishing categories with open coding, the data was reviewed and categories rearranged using axial coding, which makes connections between categories. The final step in the analysis of data in a grounded theory research project, selective coding, was not undertaken in this project due to the limited number of interviewees and time constraints of a this project.

VI. A. Researcher Bias

Merriam (1988, p. 39) observed "Because the primary instrument in qualitative . . . research is human, all observations and analyses are filtered through one's worldview, one's values, one's perspective." In class we were told researcher bias in qualitative research is not the problem it was once thought. At one time researchers were encouraged to conduct research outside their direct area of interest to reduce the possibility of bias. Now research is encouraged within one's own field to take advantage of personal knowledge and insight; however possible biases should be acknowledged (J. W. Creswell, classroom lecture, Spring Semester 1991).

Conducting this research project among my colleagues at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln I, no doubt, brought some personal biases to my research. I had my own internal perception of the role of the department head in promoting faculty growth and development, though I had never vocalized or analyzed it. This fact may have effected my understanding of statements colleagues made during the interviews. Perhaps I thought I knew exactly what they meant, when in actuality my perception was different from theirs. On the other hand, being a colleague may have helped my understanding of the phenomenon being researched and helped my interviewees to be more open and honest in expressing their opinions. Let us hope that the truth of the latter outweighs the incidence of the earlier.

VI. B. Open Coding

The first interview was conducted with an individual who, though at the university a short time (less than three years), had

been in the library profession for more than fifteen years. Open coding of the data collected resulted in the identification of six categories identifying roles the faculty member felt the department head should play in promoting faculty growth and development. See the "Chart of Categories from Open Coding" in the Appendices for a list of the categories identified in open coding.

The second interviewee was not only new to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, but also new to the profession of librarianship, having been at both only one and a half years. Open coding of this interviewee's responses supported the categories extablished after interview number one and added two new categories.

At that point, in reviewing the results of the two interviews conducted so far, I determined alternate perspectives should be included if available. I did not want my results to be biased to only Public Services library faculty perspectives, nor to junior, not yet tenured, faculty only. For the remaining two interviews I chose a recently tenured and promoted individual, and a non-tenured faculty member in the technical services division of the University Libraries. The first two interviewees were in public services, while the third began at the University Libraries in technical services and moved to public services.

During the third and fourth interviews I asked the same questions as originally generated for the research project. I did, however, interject more inquiries as the interviewees responded, so as to be sure of the meaning of their responses. At that point I was checking to be sure whether their answers fit the categories already established.

The third interviewee had ten years of experience, all at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries. Categorizing the responses from this interview added support to all eight of the previously created categories and added yet two more.

The last interviewee had less than three and one half years of experience in the library profession, with less than two of those years at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Open coding of that interview showed support for eight of the ten previously established categories.

VI. C. Axial Coding

After gathering the data from all four interviews, analyzing it, performing the open coding process, and coming up with ten initial categories, I was ready to do axial coding. Axial coding refined the original ten categories to six categories, each with their own subcategories. Those six categories, defining roles of university library department heads as perceived by library faculty members, were designated as: Advocate; Communicator; Counselor; Leader; Manager; and Motivator. Each category with a breakdown of subcategories, and activities fitting within them, is included in the Appendices.

ADVOCATE

In the role of advocate faculty members see the department head as an ally, a supporter, and someone who may be able to provide "inside help." One interviewee noted the perception that the department head at times "promotes me within other committees" to assist the faculty member in being appointed to, or asked to serve

on, library committees or projects. The "inside help" given by one department head was in the form of making contacts and "dropping names" of faculty from the department which "helped them get on various working groups or committees . . . within professional organizations in ALA (American Library Association)." The supporter within the advocate category was accepting of individual differences and needs and provided "an environment which allows failure without punishment."

COMMUNICATOR

Faculty members perceive the communicator role of the department head in two ways. The first sub-role is as an informer. All interviewees felt the department head should communicate information on activities that might prove beneficial to the faculty members' professional growth and development. "If the department chair knows of activities or opportunities which would support tenure in his or her opinion, telling the non-tenured person about the activities . . . would help towards tenure." The second factor in the communicator role is to be accessible. Faculty members feel the department head should be available when needed.

COUNSELOR

The counselor role of the department head consists of a mentoring role and an advising role. The mentor shares wisdom and gives opinions and input when asked. The advisor gives directed intervention and may monitor faculty progress toward tenure and promotion.

LEADER

The department head's leadership role consists of three aspects according to my interviewees. The department head should "lead by example." "I mean if they're telling you, you should be involved professionally and if they're not doing anything, you know, it doesn't give you a lot of motivation to go out and . . . get involved." The department head should be knowledgeable of the profession, the organization, and his or her faculty. He or she should know the day to day responsibilities of the faculty in his or her department. Leadership also includes acting as an intermediary with the library administration. The department head can "go to bat for you with your administration" whether for funding, equipment, or staffing.

MANAGER

The manager acts as a facilitator on the job allowing release time for research, class attendance, professional development activities, and committee involvements beyond the job description. The manager also delegates responsibilities and "hands out projects which help our growth and development as well as help the department."

MOTIVATOR

The role of the department head as a motivator includes providing encouragement to faculty and acting as a sort of cheerleader. Encouragement to participate "in a variety of activities" contributes to professional growth and development. The variety of activities may include committee involvements, conference attendance, participation in professional organizations, conference pre-

sentations, publication and the like. The encourager doesn't force activities on faculty, but may put things in terms of "'well have you thought about this?' rather than 'maybe you should do this.'" The cheerleader role involves positive reinforcement and a show of enthusiasm for the faculty members' efforts. "If you get patted on the back for doing something, obviously you're going to be more willing to do more in the future."

VI. D. Outliers

A couple of items should be noted in analyzing the interview data. Some information gathered from interviewees three and four varied from earlier data.

Interviewee three noted information which in the open coding process was categorized as the politician role of the department head. Although the category later became part of the leader category in axial coding, it is interesting to note that the tenured faculty member who had been at the institution the longest seemed to be the only one really aware of the politics of the organization.

Interviewee four began the interview by stating

> "I think that the faculty member's responsibility is to be aware of tenure requirements for themselves and to keep up with those things. . . . it is not a requirement that they [department heads] keep track of each faculty member, because I think it's each individual faculty member's responsibility."

This response differed markedly from the other interviewees. None of the other interviewees gave any indication they felt the department head might not have a role in promoting faculty growth and development. Interviewee four went on to answer question one in terms of what was nice for the department head to do. By the end of

answering question two interviewee four had reconsidered and stated, "I'm changing my mind. I think that is a part of their job." The individual had never before considered questions such as those I presented.

VII. Theories, Propositions, Premises

Without selective coding, the last step of analysis in a grounded theory research project, an actual grounded theory, cannot be generated. However, I will attempt to outline premises and propositions that appear relevant after open and axial coding.

PREMISES:

This research project gained insight into university library faculty members' perceptions of the role of the department head in promoting faculty growth and development. Coding the interviewees' input produced categories which outline strategies department heads can implement to support faculty members' professional development and enhance performance. Faculty look to the department head for leadership and assistance with professional growth and development. Library faculty in both public services and technical services, and both non-tenured and tenured, noted the same, or quite similar, leadership roles for the department head when considering promotion of faculty growth and development.

PROPOSITION:

Communication and leadership are essential traits of department heads who are effective in their role as promoters of faculty growth and development.

VIII. Final Review of the Literature

Although there is no literature on the specific area of the research presented here, research in related areas should be considered. Several articles and books have been published on academic department heads or chairpersons. These works almost always consider heads or chairs of teaching departments only. Some works give advice from a single author on how best to chair a department (Donnelly, 1990). Creswell, Wheeler, Seagren, Egly, and Beyer (1990) utilized qualitative research methods to gather information on the strategies used by "excellent" chairs at seventy campuses across the nation. Using the grounded theory approach Mitchell (1986, 1987) interviewed department heads to learn their management strateties to enhance faculty productivity, performance, and work satisfaction, as well as department effectiveness, and to learn the factors they felt were essential for effective department leadership.

Although I had read most of Creswell et al. (1990), Mitchell (1987), and parts of Mitchell (1986) several months had elapsed prior to conducting the research reported here. I do not believe these readings biased my research.

It is interesting to note the similarities and differences between my categories of the roles university library faculty members perceive in their department heads when considering their promotion of faculty growth and development, and the management strategies identified by Mitchell (1986, p. 136-138). Although five of the six category names I used are included in Mitchell's list,

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 3

II. Initial Review of the Literature 3

III. Basis for Using Qualitative Methods 5

IV. Questions for Research 6

V. Methodology for Data Collection 7

VI. Analysis of Collected Data 8

A. Researcher Bias 9

B. Open Coding 9

C. Axial Coding 11

D. Outliers 14

VII. Theories, Propositions, Premises 15

VIII. Final Review of the Literature 16

IX. Conclusion 17

Reference List 18

APPENDICES: 19

Project Method and Questions as originally formulated.....20

Plan for Data Collection, Analysis and Verification as originally formulated 21

Question Form used in Conducting Interviews 22

Transcription of Tape of First Interview 29

Transcription of Tape of Second Interview 35

Chart of Categories from Open Coding 42

Chart of Categories from Axial Coding 43

the subcategories and activities are almost completely distinct. This indicates our definitions of the category names are different.

IX. Conclusion

This qualitative research project introduced categories defining the role of university library department heads in promoting faculty growth and development, as perceived by library faculty members. These categories identify strategies department heads could implement to better serve their faculty's needs.

Due to the short time available to complete this project, all the steps in the grounded theory approach could not be completed. Also the scope of the research was quite narrow, including only four interviewees. It would be interesting to extend the research beyond what was presented here and expand the number of informants to see if new information would come to light. The selective coding process could be implemented and a complete grounded theory determined.

The applicability of qualitative research methods to the library setting was proven to this researcher in the course of this research. It is applicable not only to studying perceptions of library faculty or staff, but could obviously be a very useful tool in studying the perspective of library patrons in a variety of areas.

REFERENCE LIST

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Conrad, C. F. (1978). A grounded theory of academic change. Sociology of Education, 51 (April), 101-112.

Cosgriff, J., Kenney, D., & McMillan, G. (1990). Support for publishing at academic libraries: How much exists? The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 16 (2), 94-97.

Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W., Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). The academic chairperson's handbook. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Donnelly, J. (1990). Middle managers in schools and colleges: A handbook for heads of departments. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Hersberger, R. M. (1989). The challenges of leading and managing faculty status librarians. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 14 (6), 361-365.

Mellon, C. A. (1986). Library anxiety: A grounded theory and its development. College and Research Libraries, 47(2), 160-165.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mitchell, M. B. (1986). Department chairperson management strategies: Enhancing faculty performance and work satisfaction. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Mitchell, M. B. (1987). The process of department leadership. The Review of Higher Education, 11 (2), 161-176.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wallen, N. E., & Frankel, J. R. (1991). Educational research: a guide to the process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yin, R. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

A University Libraries Faculty Perspective on the Role of the Department Head: A Grounded Theory Approach

Project Method & Questions:

Project Method: Grounded Theory Approach

Plan to interview two untenured faculty members in two different departments of the University Libraries.
Will then do open coding from transcribed interviews.
Will then determine whether to continue interviewing only untenured faculty or to include some recently tenured faculty in interview process before doing axial coding.

Big Question:

From a faculty perspective, what should the role of the department head be in promoting faculty growth and development?

Other Questions:

1. What type of leadership do University Libraries faculty need from their department head to encourage greater faculty performance?

2. In what way has the department head addressed those needs? What forms of performance assistance have faculty members in the University Libraries received from their department head?

3. Are there strategies you have observed your department head, or other department heads, using with other faculty which you believe has been effective in enhancing those faculty members' professional growth or performance?

A University Libraries Faculty Perspective on the Role of the Department Head: A Grounded Theory Approach

Plan for Data Collection, Analysis and Verification:

Initially two untenured faculty members in two different departments of the University Libraries will be interviewed. The audio tapes of the interviews will be transcribed. The interview data will then be analyzed using open coding techniques.

The information gained from the open coding will help determine whether the other interviewees will also be untenured only, or if some recently tenured faculty should be interviewed as well. The information from the later interviews will be selectively transcribed. No more than a total of four or five faculty will be interviewed for this project.

As initial hypotheses develop from open coding, axial coding will be used to analyze categories. Finally the core category and related categories will be determined in selective coding.

Three approaches may be utilized to assure the validity of the findings of this project. They are triangulation, member checks, and peer examination. Multiple faculty members in the University Libraries will be interviewed for this research, thus providing triangulation for internal validity. Data gained from the interviews will be presented to the interviewees for verification. Lastly, findings will be discussed with colleagues and their views on the findings solicited.

A University Libraries Faculty Perspective on the Role of the Department Head in Faculty Performance: A Grounded Theory Approach

A. State motives and purpose

-- Find out what's in and on someone's mind
-- Get other person's perspective/perceptions
-- Respondent is expert as far as answers
-- Develop insight and understanding of phenomenon

B. Anonymity

C. Types of information to be gathered

-- Demographics (standard information)
-- Experiences
-- Opinions

Questions:

1. How long have you been in your position at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln?

2. How long have you been in the library profession?

3. Sex of interviewee: Male Female

4. From your perspective as a library faculty member in a tenure track position, what do you feel the role of the department head should be in promoting faculty growth and development?

5. What type of leadership do you feel University Libraries faculty need from their department head to encourage greater faculty performance?

6. In what ways has your department head addressed those needs?

7. What forms of performance assistance have you received from your department head?

8. Are there strategies you have observed your department head, or other department heads, using with other faculty which you believe has been effective in enhancing those faculty members' professional growth or performance?

9. Further comments or observations:

A UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IN FACULTY PERFORMANCE: A GROUNDED THEORY APPROACH

Interviewee #1 March 25, 1991 Female

Years at UNL: 2 yrs. 3 mos. Years in Profession: 19

FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE AS A LIBRARY FACULTY MEMBER IN A TENURE TRACK POSITION, WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD SHOULD BE IN PROMOTING FACULTY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT?

One of advising, one of support, of counseling and probably promotion in the respect of encouraging the person towards that end.

ANYTHING FURTHER?

Not that I know of. Do you want me to elaborate on that area at all?

YEAH

OK. What did I say?

ADVISING...

Advising would be things like when asked for input by the non-tenured person to give opinions and advice as to how to approach things or what might support achieving tenure.

The aspect of support it would be release time to achieve a variety of activities which would lead to tenure. Support also financially by the institution through the department chair, which could be beyond just release time. And just a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

positive, kind of verbal, or body language approach to promoting involvement in activities which would support ultimately tenure.

both places? Is it really either?

Counseling. That would involve encouraging participation in a variety of activities. Again if advice is sought giving their wisdom and counsel in that way. If the dept. chair does not see tangible evidence of achieving the ultimate goal, or substantial involvement that would ultimately find success as far as tenure then the counsel would be more of a guiding toward actions that would be helpful to promote ultimately tenure.

The promotion thing would be if the dept. chair knows of activities or opportunities which would support tenure in his or her opinion telling the non-tenured person about the activities and encouraging and promoting those kinds of things that would help towards tenure.

WHAT TYPE OF LEADERSHIP DO YOU FEEL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY NEED FROM THEIR DEPARTMENT HEAD TO ENCOURAGE GREATER FACULTY PERFORMANCE?

Well I would say its probably the same as I said before in the other question -- encouragement to promotion. Although I do feel that the need varies with how much

previous professional experience someone has. If I were a first or second year out into the profession I would feel probably a stronger need to have a more directed intervention by department chairs. Whereas since I've been in the field for several years I would judge I probably have a better sense of what would be expected. Although that doesn't certainly preclude the idea that each institution is different and what may be highly thought of at one institution may not carry the same weight at a new institution. So the local differences of the most value -- Knowing what is looked upon favorably at a particular institution. I can't think of anything really new other than the things I said before.

IN WHAT WAYS HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD ADDRESSED THOSE NEEDS?

OK you don't mean the supervisor then, you mean the dept. head. OK That person has provided input whenever I asked for it and at evaluation time -- that has probably been the most opportune times for both sides to bring up those issues and to clarify from both perespectives how things are going so to speak. And at other times throughout the year that per-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

son has alluded to things that perhaps I should volunteer for or undertake in light of achieving tenure.

WHAT FORMS OF PERFORMANCE ASSISTANCE HAVE YOU RECEIVED FROM YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD?

What forms? It's probably been mostly verbal. A couple of times I guess I can recall there may have been something that has been routed to me or sent directly to me. I have no way of knowing for sure but I think there are times that he promotes me within other committees that he's involved in. At least I have a sense of that.

ARE THERE STRATEGIES YOU HAVE OBSERVED YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD, OR OTHER DEPARTMENT HEADS, USING WITH OTHER FACULTY WHICH YOU BELIEVE HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE IN ENHANCING THOSE FACULTY MEMBERS' PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OR PERFORMANCE?

Well I do think that there are universities that or university library systems that do have a much more aggressive approach I suppose is the right word to library faculty achievements which would indirectly I suppose support a more viable possibility of tenure. But I certainly don't think that UNL is not below average in what they do and how they ap-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

proach it. I just do think there are places that are better at it for a variety of reasons. One of which may be they're smaller and so their involvement is more direct. If you're a dept. head that only has three or four people that you're responsible for that's different than if you're dept. head is responsible for several areas and his time is stretched thinly. And for whatever reasons I think there are institutions that have just more money available and I think that certainly can support tenure activities.

IN WHAT WAY?

Oh attendance at meetings, at workshops, release time for writing or research. The writing/research probably is the least supported within the University Libraries, release time for doing those kind of activities.

FURTHER COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS:

No I don't think so. I do think that as a whole the University Libraries here have, I do get a sense that, or at least I assume that when they hire someone they hire with an intention that those people

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

will get tenure. And so therefore they have hired people they feel capable of achieving that end and in that light I think they work towards that with the person as much as possible within some of the limitations I mentioned before.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD IN FACULTY PERFORMANCE: A GROUNDED THEORY APPROACH

Interviewee #2 March 28,1991 Male

Years at UNL: 1 yr. 7 mos. Years in Profession: same

FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE AS A LIBRARY FACULTY MEMBER IN A TENURE TRACK POSITION, WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD SHOULD BE IN PROMOTING FACULTY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT?

Well basicly I think the library supervisor/dept. head should just, how should say this, at least in this dept. since we're all so new to the profession and new to UNL she does act sort of as a facilitator in helping us with professional development, pointing out areas that are possible, encouraging us to pursue different areas of professional development, encouraging us to go to professional conferences and getting involved in committees in those organizations, which I feel is what a supervisor or dept. head should be doing in my perspective anyway. Especially as a new person to the field who didn't have an idea of how to get involved. It was helpful to have someone who had 20 years of experience in the field, sort of knew the ropes for getting involved in professional development. She also used her knowledge and positions that she cur-

rently has in order to help us get positions, which is important and I think should. Because alot of times you can't get involved without some sort of inside help. Unless somebody knows you you're not gonna be invited to be on anything and I know she has for other people in the dept. helped them get on various working groups or committees or whatever within professional organizations in ALA. I think that really is a factor or a function of a dept. head, if that's what you want. I mean if that's what your organization wants you to be professionally active. I think the dept. head should play that role. Primarily, especially (I've already said this) for people who are new to the profession.

WHAT TYPE OF LEADERSHIP DO YOU FEEL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES FACULTY NEED FROM THEIR DEPARTMENT HEAD TO ENCOURAGE GREATER FACULTY PERFORMANCE?

I think they need to see that the department head is actively involved in organizations in order for them to feel compelled to do the same. I mean if they're telling you you should be involved professionally and if they're not doing anything, you know, it doesn't give you a lot of motivation to go out and do, get

involved. The same thing with writing. If they're saying well you should get published, yet they're not published or attempting to get published it isn't going to give me a lot of motivation to go ahead and do it. The main key for getting greater faculty performance is encouragement.

I guess the biggest key to me is that the greater their performance, sort of lead by example is important. Because if they're not doing anything then it'll be hard for me to have enough motivation. You know if I don't have any respect for the performance they're doing how can I really be enthused to push on to greater... Also, they can point out possibilities and encourage faculty to try different avenues and not be harsh if things fail, harsh/judgemental. If they're willing to point out different avenues or be accepting of new ideas and things and some of them you have to realize are just gonna fail, so if there's an environment which allows failure without punishment I think that would lead to greater performance. Positive reinforcement is very important. If you get pat-

ted on the back for doing something obviously you're going to be more willing to do more in the future.

IN WHAT WAYS HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD ADDRESSED THOSE NEEDS?

Sort of alluded to that in the beginning question. She has pointed out different ways to get involved professionally. she has actually helped members of this department get involved through her positions she already has. I think she has given a lot of positive reinenforcement. She's helped me increase my performance. She's pointed things, sort of brainstormed ideas, let me know about them. She doesn't force, she gives them pretty much as "well have you thought about this..." rather than "maybe you should do this..." Which is better than being forced. And again I think she has led by example. She's published things since I've been here and she's gone to all, just about every NLA and ALA meeting and given presentations at both. So she's very active in professional organizations and she encourages. If somebody is already doing it, it's easier to do it. If you see somebody else doing it.

WHAT FORMS OF PERFORMANCE ASSISTANCE HAVE YOU RECEIVED FROM YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD?

She hasn't personally helped me get any positions or do anything like that, but she's given me alot of positive reinforcement like when I did a book review she made sure to show me her enthusiasm for that project and congratulate on it. The same thing when I did a little seminar. Actually she helped me get the seminar. It was on using maps for genealogy.

WAS THAT LOCALLY?

Yeah. It was at the local genealogical library.

She's encouraged me to go to ALA, which I did and to get involved in NLA and to take it in an organized manner, an organized approach to getting involved, starting first with the state level, getting involved there and then moving up to the national level. Sort of gave me a game plan for getting involved rather than leaving it up to myself entirely. It was helpful, especially when I wasn't from this area.

ARE THERE STRATEGIES YOU HAVE OBSERVED YOUR DEPARTMENT HEAD, OR OTHER DEPARTMENT HEADS, USING WITH OTHER FACULTY WHICH YOU BELIEVE HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE IN ENHANCING THOSE FACULTY MEMBERS' PROFESSIONAL GROWTH OR PERFORMANCE?

Well within the library system does give time, comp time or whatever for faculty members to finish up research or you know they give up to ten days a year or something, in order to do projects that are taking quite a bit of time, which I think is a good thing. I think it encourages professional growth. As well as, again this is library specific, giving sabbaticals, well I guess it's not. Sabbaticals is another way of encouraging people in professional growth.

OF COURSE THAT'S NOT AVAILABLE TO UNTENURED FACULTY, NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL YOU'VE BEEN HERE SIX YEARS

Right. Which I don't agree with, because during your tenure's when you're trying to make your biggest strides professionally. And other departments actually allow after like two or three years, allow sabbaticals, at least the English dept., I think, does which I think is, I think it's because in your first seven years that's when you're really trying to become established and once you're tenured

you are at least established in the library that you're at. So I'm not sure. I mean that, I guess that encourages people that are, already received tenure to continue. But it would be nice to have like after three or four years the ability to do that without it counting against you, either in your tenure, 'cause they'll let people off to write books in the English dept. Those two things are major encouragements. Allowing us to go to class is another, during work hours. The flexibility, again that's in this department and the library.

FURTHER COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS:

I don't think so.

Chart of Categories from Open Coding

Interviewee Number			
1	2	3	4
Financier	Financier	Financier	Financier
Cheerleader	Cheerleader	Cheerleader	
PR Rep	PR Rep	PR Rep	PR Rep
Informant	Informant	Informant	Informant
Counselor	Counselor	Counselor	Counselor
Motivator	Motivator	Motivator	Motivator
	Leader	Leader	Leader
		Supervisor	Supervisor
		Politician	
	Flexible	Flexible	Flexible

NOTES:

Cheerleader and Motivator categories were later combined into the Motivator category in axial coding.

Financier and Supervisor categories were later combined into the Manager category in axial coding.

Leader and Politician categories were later combined into the Leader category in axial coding.

The concepts in the Flexible category were merged into other categories in axial coding.

Chart of Categories from Axial Coding

Advocate	
Ally	"Promote you to others" "'Sale' you to committees" "Say good things about you" "Look out for chances for faculty to contribute"
"Inside help"	"Help to get involved" "Use contacts to help you get on committees in professional organizations"
Supporter	"Accepting of new ideas" "Not harsh if fail" "Recognize individual differences and needs" "Environment allows failure without punishment"
Communicator	
Informer	"Tell about activities" "Point out possibilities" "Make suggestions" "Communicate information" "Send memos" "Allude to things to undertake" "Route items"
Accessible	"Available" "Able to call" "Open lines of communication"
Counselor	
Mentor	"Give opinions" "Share wisdom" "Input when asked" "Brainstormed ideas for projects or research"
Advisor	"Give advice" "Directed intervention" "Watch for achievements" "Monitors progress" "Instruction and pointers on tenure folders" "Let know "how things are going" "Gave game plan for getting involved"

Leader

Lead by example	"Publishing/Writing" "Actively involved" "Commands respect" "Credible with peers" "Respected by peers" "Worthy of Trust"
Knowledgeable	"'Knew the ropes' of profession" "Knows what the organization expects" "Know faculty well enough to know needs" "Good idea of day to day job" "Understands what you do"
Intermediary with Administration	"Petition for funds" "'Go to bat for you' with the administration" "No political backstabbing"

Manager

Facilitator	"Provide release time for research" "Allow release time for class attendance" "Support leave time" "Work to provide funding for travel" "Allow time for outside professional activities" "Hire capable people" "Provide staff coverage so faculty can concentrate on projects"
Delegate	"Delegate responsibilities" "Hand out projects" "Assist with job responsibilities as needed"

Motivator

Provide encouragement	"Encourage, promote, 'push': participation conference attendance committee involvement publishing research conference presentations dialogue among faculty idea generation for projects"
Cheerleader	"Positive approach" "Positive reinforcement" "'Pats on the back'" "Shows enthusiasm" "Congratulates on accomplishments" "Supportive" "Shows confidence in you" "'Behind' you" "Coach"